UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,248	12/19/2001	Masanori Aritomi	35.C16075	7217

5514 7590 03/01/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
PITARO, RYAN F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/021,248	ARITOMI, MASANORI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan F Pitaro	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *27-34* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 12/13/2004.

3. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 23, 24,25, are independent claims. In the Amendment A, Claims 1-26 were amended, and Claims 27-34 were added as new, but are withdrawn from consideration due an election of the original claims cited in the previous action. This action is made Final.

Election/Restrictions

4. Upon initial review of the claims it appears that claims 1-34 differ in subject matter and therefore require a different search. In accordance with this a restriction is deemed proper.

5. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Group I. Claims 1-26 are drawn to hierarchical navigation in a list, wherein there are means to navigate through the links of a structure in an interface, classified Class 715, subclass 853.

Group II. Claims 27-34 are drawn to the relationships based on user profiles, wherein the profiles reveal a location based relevance to the user, classified in Class 715, subclass 745.

6. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Groups I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. While invention I has separate utility for navigating a hierarchy, invention II is directed towards a method for locating devices based on locality. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and divergent subject matter, and because the searches for the individual Groups are not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Newly submitted claims 27-34 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Applicant states the aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 27 is directed to "displaying a display screen such that a first peripheral device connected to another of the plurality of network segments are positioned at respective predetermined directory layers in accordance with the number of computers positioned between the information processing apparatus and the one and the other network segments."

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 27-34 are withdrawn from consideration

as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1,4,8,11,15,18,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Guzak et al. ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Guzak et al. ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) in view of Windows NT ("WinNT", screen shots).

As per claim 1, Guzak discloses an information processing apparatus (Column 3 lines 13-16) comprising: a storage device (Column 3 lines 13-16), for storing the peripheral objects for predetermined devices based on directory information; (Column 3 lines 43-49 & Figure 2) detection means (Column 3 lines 26-28 *wherein tree view control displays a view of items as per code instructions)* for detecting a specific object detected by said detection means; display means (Column 1 lines 59-61), for displaying, in accordance with a tree list (Column 2 lines 58-61); said specific object detected by

said detection means; control means (Column 25-26 lines 26-30), for, based on the number of steps along a directory path (Column 6 lines 25-31) leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to said information processing apparatus to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to said information processing apparatus (Figure 2; *wherein the exploring view shows a local computer (item 36) with a directory path to the specific object corresponding to a peripheral device (see printers of item category 32) and item 38 shows an expandable directory for a network neighborhood inherently containing non-local expandable directories containing therein similar directories to the local ones. These directories would include shared hard drives, folders, and printers.)*, permitting said display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by said detection means. If Guzak does not distinctly show the specific object, WinNT expressly teaches control means (Column 25-26 lines 26-30), for, based on the number of steps along a directory path (Column 6 lines 25-31) leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to said information processing apparatus (Figure 1; *wherein the exploring view shows a local computer (item 50) with a directory path to the specific object corresponding to a peripheral device (item 55))* to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to said information processing apparatus (Figure 1; *wherein the exploring view shows a non-local computer (item 70) with a directory path to the specific object corresponding to a peripheral device (item 75))*, permitting said display means to display, in accordance

with the tree list, the specific object detected by said detection means. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the apparatus of Guzak with the current teaching of WinNT. Motivation to do so would have been to provide the specific objects corresponding to non-local peripheral devices.

As per claims 4, Guzak \ Guzak-WinNT teaches an information processing apparatus, wherein said control means performs the sorting for an object display, so that the specific object is displayed at a higher location on a list (Figure 9 *where the tree's objects are sorted by alphabetical order by 1.drive letter then by 2.folder name).*

Claims 8,15 are individually similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 and 18 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, Guzak \ Guzak-WinNT teaches a computer readable storage medium (Figure 1 item 16) for storing the control program.

9. Claims 2, 9,16, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Maarek et al ("Maarek", US# 5,895,474)

As per claim 2, Guzak fails to disclose a control means where it omits an intermediate directory path leading to a specific object. However, Maarek teaches such a method providing an interactive, tree structured, graphical visualization aid wherein a

control means for omitting an intermediate path is applied (Column 6 lines 9-15 & Figures 4a-4c). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maarek 's teaching with Guzak's apparatus to ease the visualization effort by reducing the clutter on the screen (Maarek, Column 6 lines 23-24).

Claims 9,16 are individually similar to scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, Guzak discloses an information processing apparatus (Column 3 lines 13-16) capable of communicating with a plurality of peripheral devices, said apparatus comprising: a storage device (Column 3 lines 13-16), for storing predetermined objects for the peripheral devices based on directory information; (Column 3 lines 43-49 & Figure 2) detection means (Column 3 lines 26-28 *wherein tree view control displays a view of items as per code instructions)* for detecting a specific object in the directory information read from said storage device; display means (Column 1 lines 59-61), for displaying, in accordance with a tree list (Column 2 lines 58-61); the specific object detected by said detection means; control means (Column 25-26 lines 26-30), for, based on the number of steps along a directory path (Column 6 lines 25-31) leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to said information processing apparatus to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to said information processing apparatus (Figure 2; *wherein the exploring view shows a local computer (item 36) with a directory path to the specific object corresponding to a peripheral device (see printers of item category 32) and item 38 shows an expandable directory for a*

network neighborhood inherently containing non-local expandable directories containing therein similar directories to the local ones. These directories would include shared hard drives, folders, and printers.), permitting said display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by said detection means. Guzak fails to disclose a control means where it omits an intermediate directory path leading to a specific object. However, Maarek teaches a control means, for, when the object detected by said detection means is to be displayed on said display means in accordance with a tree list, omitting an intermediate directory path the specific object (Column 6 lines 9-15 & Figures 4a-4c).

Claims 24 and 25 are individually similar in scope to claim 23, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 22, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

10. Claims 2, 9,16, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) in view of Windows NT ("WinNT", screen shots), and further in view of Maarek et al ("Maarek", US# 5,895,474).

As per claim 2, Guzak-WinNT fails to disclose a control means where it omits an intermediate directory path leading to a specific object. However, Maarek teaches such a method providing an interactive, tree structured, graphical visualization aid wherein a control means for omitting an intermediate path is applied (Column 6 lines 9-15 & Figures 4a-4c). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maarek 's teaching

with Guzak's apparatus to ease the visualization effort by reducing the clutter on the screen (Maarek, Column 6 lines 23-24).

Claims 9,16 are individually similar to scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, Guzak-WinNT discloses an information processing apparatus (Column 3 lines 13-16) capable of communicating with a plurality of peripheral devices, said apparatus comprising: a storage device (Column 3 lines 13-16), for storing predetermined objects for the peripheral devices based on directory information; (Column 3 lines 43-49 & Figure 2) detection means (Column 3 lines 26-28 *wherein tree view control displays a view of items as per code instructions)* for detecting a specific object detected by the detection means; display means (Column 1 lines 59-61), for displaying, in accordance with a tree list (Column 2 lines 58-61); the specific object detected by said detection means; control means (Column 25-26 lines 26-30), for, based on the number of steps along a directory path (Column 6 lines 25-31) leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to said information processing apparatus (Figure 1; *wherein the exploring view shows a local computer (item 50) with a directory path to the specific object corresponding to a peripheral device (item 55))* to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to said information processing apparatus (Figure 1; *wherein the exploring view shows a non- local computer (item 70) with a directory path to the specific object corresponding to a peripheral device (item 75))*, permitting said display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object

detected by said detection means. Guzak-WinNT fails to disclose a control means where it omits an intermediate directory path leading to a specific object. However, Maarek teaches such a method providing an interactive, tree structured, graphical visualization aid wherein a control means for omitting an intermediate path is applied (Column 6 lines 9-15 & Figures 4a-4c).

Claims 24 and 25 are individually similar in scope to claim 23, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 22, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

11. Claims 3,5,10,12,17,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mital et al ("Mital", US# 6,003,040).

As per claim 3, Guzak fails to disclose an information processing apparatus, wherein, before the specific object detected by said detection means is displayed on said display means in accordance with the tree list, said control means omits a directory path in which the specific object is not present. However, Mital teaches such an apparatus and method for storing and navigating among data items in which the directory path is omitted if said specific object is not present (Column 23 lines 42-47 *a result of the query shows only the relevant results and hides the rest of the hierarchy*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mital's teaching with Guzak's apparatus so that the display of the knowledge can be achieved without significantly

adding to or making more complex the minimized domain of user interface for the benefit of non-complexity.

As per claim 5, Guzak fails to disclose an information processing apparatus, wherein, when the specific object detected by said detection means is to be displayed on said display means in accordance with the tree list, and when the specific object cannot be referred to directly due to access right limitations, said control means displays a higher object for which there are no access right problems. However, Mital teaches such an apparatus which displays according to access right limitations a higher object, which there are no access right problems (Column 24 lines 9-12 *where users can only see only some of the object instances and links within the system based on access rights*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mital's teaching with Guzak's apparatus so that the display of information would not include inaccessible objects; therefore, displaying the relevant objects at a higher position on the tree for the benefit of finding more relevant objects.

Claims 10 and 17 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12 and 19 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

12. Claims 3,5,10,12,17,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) in view of Windows NT ("WinNT", scréen shots), and further in view of Mital et al ("Mital", US# 6,003,040).

As per claim 3, Guzak-WinNT fails to disclose an information processing apparatus, wherein, before the specific object detected by said detection means is displayed on said display means in accordance with the tree list, said control means omits a directory path in which the specific object is not present. However, Mital teaches such an apparatus and method for storing and navigating among data items in which the directory path is omitted if said specific object is not present (Column 23 lines 42-47 *a result of the query shows only the relevant results and hides the rest of the hierarchy*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mital's teaching with Guzak- WinNT's apparatus so that the display of the knowledge can be achieved without significantly adding to or making more complex the minimized domain of user interface for the benefit of non-complexity.

As per claim 5, Guzak- WinNT fails to disclose an information processing apparatus, wherein, when said specific object detected by said detection means is to be displayed on said display means in accordance with said tree list, and when said specific object can not be referred to directly due to access right limitations, said control means displays a higher object for which there are no access right problems. However, Mital teaches such an apparatus which displays according to access right limitations a higher object, which there are no access right problems (Column 24 lines 9-12 *where users can only see only some of the object instances and links within the system based on access rights*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mital's teaching with Guzak-WinNT's apparatus so that the display of information would not include

inaccessible objects; therefore, displaying the relevant objects at a higher position on the tree for the benefit of finding more relevant objects.

Claims 10 and 17 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12 and 19 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

13. Claims 6,13,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cowart ("Cowart", *Mastering Windows 95*).

As per claim 6, Guzak fails to disclose an information processing apparatus; wherein the specific object is an object for a printer device. However, Cowart teaches a tree structure in which a specific object is a printer device (Figure 8.4 page 377). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Cowart's teaching and Guzak's apparatus so that objects for printing devices could have been organized in such a manner as any other object found in Guzak for organizational purposes.

Claims 13 and 20 are individually similar to scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

14. Claims 6,13,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) in view of Windows NT ("WinNT", screen shots), and further in view of Cowart ("Cowart", *Mastering Windows 95*).

As per claim 6, Guzak-WinNT fails to disclose an information processing apparatus; wherein said specific object is an object for a printer device. However, Cowart teaches a tree structure in which a specific object is a printer device (Figure 8.4 page 377). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Cowart's teaching and Guzak-WinNT's apparatus so that objects for printing devices could have been organized in such a manner as any other object found in Guzak-WinNT for organizational purposes.

Claims 13 and 20 are individually similar to scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

15. Claims 7,14,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319).

As per claim 7 Guzak further fails to disclose an object for a compound device including a printer function. Official Notice is given that the use of a compound device including a printer function is notoriously well known in the art; examples of which are: printer/scanners, printer/fax, printer/copier, and any combination thereof. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the use of a compound device including a printer function with Guzak's apparatus so that a multifunctional printer could be a specific object listed in the hierarchical tree for the benefit of functionality.

Claims 14 and 21 are individually similar to scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

16. Claims 7,14,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) and Windows NT ("WinNT", screen shots)

As per claim 7 Guzak-WinNT fails to disclose an object for a compound device including a printer function. Official Notice is given that the use of a compound device including a printer function is notoriously well known in the art; examples of which are: printer/scanners, printer/fax, printer/copier, and any combination thereof. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the use of a compound device including a printer function with Guzak-WinNT's apparatus so that a multifunctional printer could be a specific object listed in the hierarchical tree for the benefit of functionality.

Claims 14 and 21 are individually similar to scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,8,15,23-25 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

Per claims 1,8, and 15 the applicant argues that Guzak does not disclose

(a) "control means for, based on the number of steps along a directory path leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to the information processing apparatus to the specific object"

(b) "corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to the information processing apparatus, "

Per claims 23-25, the Applicant argues:

(c) Claim 23 is not similar in scope to that of claim 2.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a) by displaying a hierarchical list of items Guzak shows a directory path, which corresponds to a local desktop, stepping through that path yields printers, which are local to that computer.

Per (b) by displaying an expandable path to the network, Guzak inherently shows that other computers similar to that of (a) can be located from the Network Neighborhood and once located would be known to have similar features such as a directory path corresponding to its local printers.

Per (c) claim 23 is similar to claim 1, but with the added feature of omitting a path directory path which was introduced in claim 2. Since claim 2 has all the limitations of the claims it depends upon. Claims 23-25 are similar in scope to that of claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday, and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100